

quest for a rate hike. They would return to their Idaho customers their share of the \$7,009,000 in overcharges that they collected during the years 1956 through 1960 by reducing instead of increasing the present unnecessarily high power rates they are charging hard-pressed Idaho farmers and power users at a time when they are reporting an increase in their annual profits.

CONGRESS OF RACIAL EQUALITY

(Mr. WILLIAMS, asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent civil rights debate, every Member of this body was aware of the constant presence of special interest lobbyists in behalf of the bill. These people, representing various pressure groups, conducted the most brazenly insulting high pressure lobbying activities that I have seen in the time I have been a Member of this body.

One of these outfits, which has since claimed credit for having helped "lobby" the civil rights bill through the House, and which now brags about the tactics it used to coerce Members into voting their way, is a motley crowd of professional agitators calling themselves the "Congress of Racial Equality." Its national director is a hate-peddling racketeer by the name of James Farmer.

Recently, on a nationwide television broadcast, Farmer bragged vociferously of his lobbying activities on the civil rights bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have checked with the Clerk of the House, and I find that neither the Congress of Racial Equality nor its national director, James Farmer, is registered with this body as required by law. Is it possible that these people consider themselves to be above the laws of the United States as they have demonstrated they feel about the laws of our States? In an attempt to get the answer to that question, I have written a letter to Hon. David Acheson, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, calling these facts to his attention. It will be interesting, indeed, to learn whether these people will be subjected to equal justice under the law, as has been meted out to others who have committed the same offense.

For the information of the House, I am including herewith a copy of my letter to Mr. Acheson.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1964.

HON. DAVID C. ACHESON,
U.S. Attorney, District of Columbia,
U.S. Courthouse, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ACHESON: On the CBS television and CBS radio networks, Sunday, February 16, 1964, James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, made the following statement with reference to the civil rights bill:

"We had lobbyists from CORE in Washington talking with Congressmen and demanding that they vote on the bill and vote for the strong legislation. We will be doing the same in the Senate. We will have even more lobbyists and, if necessary, there will be direct action."

I am informed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives that neither James Farmer

nor the Congress of Racial Equality have registered in accordance with section 287 of title 2 of the United States Code.

Perhaps you will want to initiate an investigation to determine whether there has been a violation of the law in this instance. I would appreciate your informing me of your findings.

Thanking you, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—MAN OR MOUSE?

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of yesterday carried a story on the recent Supreme Court decision in the case of Wesberry against Sanders, where the Supreme Court takes unto itself the right to determine the qualifications of Members of Congress. This article is headed:

HIGH COURT'S NEW ROLE

The decision on congressional districts points up its enlarged role in the government structure.

Mr. Speaker, acting under the threat of this decision, the State Legislature of the State of Georgia passed a redistricting bill 25 minutes after midnight on the last day allowed, only to pick up today's paper to see that, in all likelihood, their action would not satisfy the Supreme Court dictatorship.

Our colleagues from Texas and Maryland are under the gun right now. Shortly the rest of the States might well be, for 398 Members of the 435 in this body come from States whose districts are illegal according to the only yardstick mentioned in the Court's opinion. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives must once and for all serve notice that it will not surrender the powers granted to it under the Constitution.

I call on all Members to urge the Committee on Rules and the Committee on House Administration to report, at the earliest possible moment, House Resolution 628 and House Resolution 629, which I introduced on February 19 and copies of which appear on page 3049 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

By adopting these resolutions we would tell the Supreme Court in no uncertain terms that the Constitution provides for the House of Representatives to be the sole judge of the qualification of its Members. If there is need to require equal and contiguous districts, we should follow the constitutional approach and have the House of Representatives work its will in this area. Under this approach the disruptive effect of action by the Supreme Court would be avoided.

In fact, until 1929, following each census the law passed by the Congress provided for contiguous districts of somewhat equal population. There is no reason for the House of Representatives to pay any attention whatsoever to the decision of the Supreme Court in this area, for the Constitution provides:

Each House is the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members.

The House has jealously guarded this power with regard to contested elections. Seating of a Member is never determined by the courts, but by the House itself.

To adhere to the Court's usurpation of power would make the House of Representatives a party to its own destruction. If we do not stand up now, truly the House of Representatives will deserve to be listed as nothing but a rubber stamp for the executive and judiciary, to be belittled on every hand by anyone who wishes.

THE "DON'T BE BEASTLY TO CASTRO" SCHOOL

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include an article.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Columnist William S. White has informed the "don't be beastly to Castro" school that it is the desire of the American people that our Government move ahead with the foreign aid cutoffs and other steps to tighten the economic blockade against Cuba. He points out that this is just the beginning, not the end, of our determination to stop our "friends and allies" from further strengthening Castro.

Mr. White concludes his column by pointing out that those who are against economic sanctions against Castro are also against any form of effective action. "If we are not to try to bring him down through economic sanctions, what sanctions are left," Mr. White asks. "What, indeed is actually the policy of the 'don't be beastly to Castro school?' What is it, despite all the fine talk, but permanent appeasement?"

I ask that this entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

THE DON'T BE BEASTLY SCHOOL (By William S. White)

Notwithstanding all the shrill laments of the don't be beastly to Castro school, the U.S. Government is going right ahead in determination to do something real about the standing menace of the armed Communist beachhead that is Cuba.

President Johnson's action in cutting off military aid to countries persisting in trading with Mr. Castro is only the first step. Predictably, a howl of protest is going up from certain political and editorial quarters. These invariably find something wrong in any effort anywhere to put any genuine squeeze upon Mr. Castro or upon those ill-advised Western allies who are steadily strengthening a Cuban economy which the United States is trying so hard to weaken.

Of course, most of these critics not only encouraged Mr. Castro's "democratic revolution" in the first place but also stooged for him long after it had become indisputable that he was the head of a Soviet-dominated vanguard in this hemisphere. They have an investment in a mortal error of previous judgment. Frantically they are still protecting that investment.

The fact is that this one long-delayed step against Castroism—the curtailment of aid to Castro helpers—is the beginning and not the end. The Johnson administration has not the slightest intention to sit down and let Mr. Castro be further entrenched. The coming months will see not less but more thrusts to tighten the screws on Cuba. Certain additional measures, indeed, are already in preparation.

Cuba file

CRITICS CITE ELECTION

The central motive is nothing less than the security of the United States and of Latin America. But some critics are suggesting that the true reason is only that this is a presidential election year. Even if this were so, as it is not, then so what? It is not easy to see what is wrong with a decent response by a democratic government to the undoubted sentiment of a vast majority of the American people that wrist-tapping is no longer a proper way to deal with Castroism.

In the meantime, and pending the full development of other steps against Castro Cuba, the objections to cutting off military aid to such determined traders with Mr. Castro as Britain and France are worth examining.

It is complained that the military aid involved is small, anyhow. True. It is complained that this is a harsh business indicating that our aid program to foreign countries might have some dreadful "string" attached to it. True; and why not? Are vital American interests to be eternally waived lest somebody be able to say that for once we are committing the crime of trying to look after ourselves—and of others too weak to look after themselves?

ALLIED TRADE HELD VITAL

It is said that the United States itself sells wheat to Russia, so why shouldn't Britain and the others send heavy equipment to Cuba? The answer is easy, except to those who have never been willing to support an actual blow to Mr. Castro and never will be. Wheat is to eat, and this Government itself is not attempting to halt any sale of food to Cuba. But machines of all kinds are Mr. Castro's greatest need in maintaining his grip on the island, for machines are almost as important to him now as shooting weapons.

Finally, most of those who object to any interruption of trade with Mr. Castro also object, and most violently, to any sort of military measure against him, for any reason, any time. If we are not to try to bring him down through economic sanctions, what sanctions are left? What, indeed, is actually the policy of the don't-be-beastly-to-Castro school? What is it, despite all the fine talk but permanent appeasement?

Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200170101-8

HOW TO TEACH OUR CHILDREN WITHOUT REALLY TRYING

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, recently the overseas teachers received a raise across the board of \$100. This increase was for the period of 1963-64 school year. This has been the first increase in overseas dependents schools salary schedule since September 1960. At that time starting salaries were fixed at rates equal to those paid teachers in large U.S. school systems in September 1959. This was in line with a law passed in 1959 by the Congress, Public Law 86-91, Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act. The directive issued by the U.S. Department of Defense which established the September 1960 salary rates recognized this schedule. This directive, the salary determination procedures, has not been followed because funds have not been provided.

If the salary directive had been fully implemented, the starting salaries of overseas teachers would be at least 9.6 percent higher in 1962-63 than they are. As a group overseas teachers have lost more than \$4 million in the past 3 years by the failure of the Department of Defense to pay the salaries rightfully due them. During this period that teachers' salaries have stood still other civilian Federal employees have had two pay raises averaging 13 percent. It is no wonder the annual teacher resignation rate overseas is over three times the national average.

Public Law 86-91, the Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, directs the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations governing "the fixing of the rates of basic compensation of teaching positions in relation to the rates of basic compensation for similar positions in the United States," and not in excess of salaries paid in the public schools of the District of Columbia.

These regulations, when issued in August 1960 provided that the amounts of salaries were to be established in relation to salaries paid teachers in U.S. urban school jurisdictions of 100,000 population and over.

The Department of Defense has not implemented its salary formula since

provided each year the basic survey data expected by the formula.

This year's findings indicate that the arithmetic average of the salary for beginning or first-year teachers in the bachelor's degree salary class in the salary schedule of urban school districts of 100,000 population or more is \$4,693. The average step-rate increases based upon experience are \$201.

The table on the last page compares the schedule used in the overseas schools this year, with the recent \$100 raise included, with the survey data for 1962-63 and 1963-64 and with the schedule in effect at the beginning of the school year 1963-64 for public school teachers in the District of Columbia.

On January 17, 1963, the Department of Defense asked Congress for a modest increase of less than 2 percent in the funding of its overseas schools for 1963-64. This request, even if authorized by the Congress, would be insufficient to bring about the justified pay increase for teachers and the educational improvements long recommended by the Overseas Education Association, the National Education Association, and the recent survey.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the Department of Defense to improve their school facilities, unify the administration of the schools, strengthen its educational program, and pay the teachers a professional salary.

Salary schedule comparisons with overseas teachers' schedule

Salary class	Schedule in DOD overseas schools, 1962-63	Average schedule in large urban school districts, 1962-63	Salary schedule in District of Columbia schools, 1963-64	Average schedule in large urban school districts, 1963-64
Bachelor's degree.....	(a) \$4,185 (b) 4,350 1..... 4,635 2..... 4,720 3..... 4,805 4..... 5,000 5..... 5,275 6..... 5,480 7..... 5,645 8..... 5,850 9..... 6,015	1..... \$4,549 2..... 4,745 3..... 4,941 4..... 5,137 5..... 5,333 6..... 5,529 7..... 5,725 8..... 5,921 9..... 6,117 10..... 6,313 11..... 6,509 12..... 6,705 13..... 6,905	1..... \$5,000 2..... 5,200 3..... 5,400 4..... 5,600 5..... 5,800 6..... 6,000 7..... 6,200 8..... 6,400 9..... 6,600 10..... 6,800 11..... 7,000 12..... 7,200 13..... 7,400 14..... 7,600	1..... \$4,693 2..... 4,894 3..... 5,095 4..... 5,296 5..... 5,497 6..... 5,698 7..... 5,899 8..... 6,100 9..... 6,301 10..... 6,502 11..... 6,703 12..... 6,904 13..... 7,104
Master's degree.....	(a) 14,385 (b) 14,650 1..... 14,735 2..... 14,920 3..... 15,105 4..... 15,290 5..... 15,475 6..... 15,660 7..... 15,845 8..... 16,030 9..... 16,215	1..... 4,903 2..... 5,108 3..... 5,313 4..... 5,518 5..... 5,723 6..... 5,928 7..... 6,133 8..... 6,338 9..... 6,543 10..... 6,748 11..... 6,953 12..... 7,158 13..... 7,363 14..... 7,568	1..... 5,700 2..... 5,900 3..... 6,100 4..... 6,300 5..... 6,500 6..... 6,700 7..... 6,900 8..... 7,100 9..... 7,300 10..... 7,500 11..... 7,700 12..... 7,900 13..... 8,100 14..... 8,300	1..... 5,084 2..... 5,277 3..... 5,469 4..... 5,660 5..... 5,851 6..... 6,042 7..... 6,233 8..... 6,424 9..... 6,615 10..... 6,806 11..... 6,997 12..... 7,188 13..... 7,379 14..... 7,570
Master's degree plus 30.....	(a) 14,415 (b) 14,650 1..... 14,835 2..... 15,020 3..... 15,205 4..... 15,390 5..... 15,575 6..... 15,760 7..... 15,945 8..... 16,130 9..... 16,315	1..... 5,453 2..... 5,658 3..... 5,863 4..... 6,068 5..... 6,273 6..... 6,478 7..... 6,683 8..... 6,888 9..... 7,093 10..... 7,298 11..... 7,503 12..... 7,708 13..... 7,913 14..... 8,118	1..... 5,700 2..... 5,900 3..... 6,100 4..... 6,300 5..... 6,500 6..... 6,700 7..... 6,900 8..... 7,100 9..... 7,300 10..... 7,500 11..... 7,700 12..... 7,900 13..... 8,100 14..... 8,300	1..... 5,661 2..... 5,859 3..... 6,057 4..... 6,255 5..... 6,453 6..... 6,651 7..... 6,849 8..... 7,047 9..... 7,245 10..... 7,443 11..... 7,641 12..... 7,839 13..... 8,037 14..... 8,235

¹ Steps (a) and (b) on DOD schedules are used for teachers not possessing the minimum qualifications of 2 years' experience and required degree.

² Final step includes adjustment (more or less than other increments) to reach average scheduled maximum in step 14. Final step is 14 years of service and no step 15.

LIMITING IMPORTS OF BEEF

(Mr. McLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement by the Agriculture Department and State Department concerning an agreement with Australia and New Zealand limiting the imports of beef into this country has not caused the exuberance among persons in the cattle industry that was hoped.

As early as last April I introduced legislation concerning this problem as did many other Members of Congress. There is no need to review the history of this legislation as most Members are fully aware that no hearings were granted so that the subject matter might be brought out into the open.

From that time on I, along with other Members, have been calling upon the administration to do something about the beef import problem. As many Members know it was months before either the Agriculture Department or the State Department even acknowledged that the imports of meats into this country had any effect on our domestic market. Very frankly, about the only good which has come out of this recent agreement is the acknowledgement by our Government that the problem is one of concern and that steps should be taken to protect our own American citizens.

Once more, in the signing of this agreement, it is apparent to many of us that the administration is more concerned with creating an image than they are in actually solving the problem.

It was very disturbing to me to learn that in the agreement entered into the 2 highest years in the history were used as selecting the average for a limitation base for 1964 imports. I think it only fair that we again ask is this a surrender to external pressures on our part, and is this another example where the cattle producers of America are being used as pawns in this international game of chess?

We have been told repeatedly that if legislative action was taken to correct the situation it would create bad feelings with other nations and that the problem should best be solved by voluntary agreement. None of us can take issue with this approach if in working out voluntary agreements it did not work to the detriment of our own citizens.

I think it should further be pointed out to the Members of this body that while it is true there have been some limitations placed upon the imports of meat that it is also significant that it would appear there is a real defect in this agreement. I shall attempt to explain.

Under this agreement Australia and New Zealand propose to limit exports to the United States of beef and veal "in all forms except canned, cured, and cooked meat and live animals." Granted that in this category at the present time it may represent only a minor portion of the imports from these two countries, nevertheless, it would seem to me that these products should have been excluded from the base because of the effect it might have in setting precedents in further negotiations with other countries.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that since this agreement fails to place any limitation at all on canned, cured, or cooked meat imported into this country, if past experience means anything we can look for a rapid increase in imports of this type of meat.

I think it also rather interesting that when the State Department made their news release concerning this agreement this matter of canned meats was not mentioned. Are we again seeing an example of managed news and are we attempting to kid a vital segment of our American society?

In addition to this defect in the agreement I am sure I share the disappointment of many other Members that in negotiating we did not insist that some other period be taken as a base in arriving at the amount of meat which could be imported. By taking the 1962-63 average, which was the highest in the history, plus the fact we included a so-called escalator clause in which imports might be raised on a percentage basis depending upon the total amount of domestic consumption, it would seem we have once more placed our own people at a decided disadvantage.

It is my understanding already bills have been introduced in the Senate which would provide a base of limitation representative by the average of the last 5 years of imports. While this is a rather different approach than my original bill which would have increased tariffs if the imports exceeded the average of the past 5 years it would seem this new idea, as expressed in the Senate bill, is a far better solution than what has been obtained on a voluntary basis.

In any event I feel the time has come for immediate action and that this problem should be met head on lest the situation this year becomes worse.

MOVING COSTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees transferred in the interest of the Government to a different geographical location and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of civilian employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to explain the purpose and justification in detail of my bill.

PURPOSE

To reduce the financial losses of employees transferred in the interest of the Government, thereby increasing the acceptance of transfers by employees with consequent benefit to the morale and efficiency of the Federal work force.

JUSTIFICATION

The Federal Government frequently needs to transfer its employees from one place to another. Sometimes this is necessary because of changes in program,

workload, or organization, or because persons qualified to do the work are not available locally. Certain career systems, such as the Forest Service, depend on progressive geographical movement of employees to positions of increasing responsibility. Some types of work, such as bank examining, require periodic moves of personnel in the interest of maintaining objectivity. In short, for numerous good reasons it is in the Government's interest to be able to shift personnel readily from place to place.

Under current legislative authority, the Government pays for some of the basic costs of moving its employees, for example, transportation of the employee, his family, and his household goods. There is ample evidence to indicate that for most employees these payments fall substantially short of covering all the necessary and reasonable expenses related to moving. Understandably, this leads to reluctance to move. When employees are unable or unwilling to transfer, Government's efficiency drops and its costs go up. Besides losing the services of experienced employees, agencies may have to promote less well-qualified people or spend extra time and money to find, hire, and train new people to do the work. When employees do make the transfers they often suffer, in addition to the inconvenience and the emotional stress of an undesired move, direct financial losses which they have no way of recovering. Agencies say that the certain prospect of financial losses which the employee can ill afford frequently tips the scale against the experienced employee's making the move his agency needs to have him make.

There is also a question of equity involved. When the Government initiates an employee move and expects to benefit from it, it is not fair to the employee to make him pay substantial sums for expenses which are not reimbursed under existing law.

HOW MUCH DO EMPLOYEES LOSE?

To obtain recent information on moving costs, the Civil Service Commission, with the cooperation of a number of Federal agencies, conducted a voluntary survey of the expenses of more than 5,000 Federal employees moving in the United States in fiscal 1962 for the convenience of the Government. The results showed that more than four employees in five lost money on their move. The average loss was \$558. A significant number of respondents—17 percent—lost more than \$1,000.

WHAT WERE THE LOSSES FOR?

Heaviest losses were from closing costs on the sale of the employee's old home—average \$677—followed by closing costs on new homes—average \$297—above normal living costs of employees reporting to the new job ahead of their families—average \$257—and cost of temporary quarters for the family—average \$134. Other types of losses averaged \$100 or less and included cost of house-hunting trips, above normal food and lodging costs for dependents, trips to the old home to help move, and losses on shipment of household goods—one respondent in five, with dependents, shipped goods in excess of the 7,000-pound limit for reimbursement. None of

February 24

these losses typically incurred by employees are reimbursable under existing law. In addition, employees reported many other incidental or unforeseen expenses not included in the figures given above.

WHAT IS DONE FOR OTHERS?

The Government already provides a special relocation allowance, equal to the basic monthly allowance for quarters, for members of the uniformed services whose dependents move when the man has a permanent change of station—Career Incentive Act of 1955, Public Law 20, 84th Congress.

The Government already provides for officers and employees transferring under the Foreign Service Act of 1946 allowances and reimbursement covering many expenses of the kinds that produced the loss figures cited—60 Stat. 1025, 1026, and 1027. Legislation passed in the 86th Congress provides other civilian employees assigned to foreign areas with special transfer allowances for extraordinary, necessary, and reasonable expenses, not otherwise compensated for—Public Law 86-707.

Business, too, is far more generous in reimbursing its employees for company moves than is the Government in dealing with its civilian employees. As periodic studies by the National Industrial Conference Board have shown, the great majority of businesses surveyed reimburse employees for such items as travel expenses of the family and temporary living expenses. In addition, other allowances or combinations are granted, especially in the case of management and professional employees who frequently are afforded various types of assistance in disposing of homes and in meeting other expenses.

The financial penalty imposed on employees who move at Government request should be reduced. The burden on employees is substantial and far less assistance in meeting it is provided civilian employees transferred within the United States than is provided for military personnel, persons on foreign assignment, and business employees.

ITEM COVERAGE

The terms of the proposed legislation are broad enough to provide needed flexibility within the types of expenses covered. For example, the bill would eliminate the current reimbursable limit of 7,000 pounds on shipment of household goods, now exceeded by about 1 in 5 persons with dependents. Limits could be set by regulation and changed from time to time to reflect changes in living standards so as not to penalize employees for normal accumulation of household goods.

Under the bill employees moving to isolated locations where they cannot use their household goods could be reimbursed under regulations issued by their agency for up to 3 years storage of goods in an amount not to exceed the maximum weight the employee would be entitled to move under the regulations governing moves generally.

Reimbursement for family travel could be set by regulation at an appropriate rate, for example, one-half the regular

per diem rate for the spouse plus one-fourth for each dependent. Reimbursement for temporary living expenses could be structured according to a similar scale, with additional features such as diminishing rates over a 30-day period to encourage rapid moves to permanent quarters.

EMPLOYEE COVERAGE

The proposed legislation would not apply to Foreign Service officers or to other employees transferring to foreign areas. Other groups excluded are: intermittently employed experts and consultants on per diem pay; employees transferring in their own interest; and all other persons not entitled to Government-paid travel.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Regulations for administration of the proposed legislation, including the method and amount of reimbursements and who would be eligible to receive them, would be issued for the President by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, who prescribes other regulations under the Administrative Expenses Act. For interagency moves, the head of the agency to which the move is made would determine whether a transfer is in the Government's interest.

Administrative experience and changing times may necessitate periodic changes in the method and amount of reimbursements authorized. The overall sums involved would, of course, be controlled by Congress through the appropriation process. But as has been indicated, the language of the bill is flexible enough so that changes in the payments themselves could be accomplished by regulation.

ESTIMATED COSTS

In accordance with the provisions of the act of July 25, 1956, 70 Stat 652—5 U.S.C. 642a—we estimate the Government-wide cost of the proposed legislation for the first year after enactment at about \$3 million. This figure is based on cost data obtained from the moving expense study, as applied to an estimated 35,000 employees relocated each year in the interest of the Government. It assumes a structure of payments such as that indicated in item coverage above and a continuation of the pattern of moves as to distance, family size, time in temporary quarters, and so on as found in our survey. Costs for the following 4 years are dependent on the extent to which agencies will find it necessary to transfer personnel from one locality to another, but are not expected to exceed the first year's cost estimate.

The proposed legislation will not involve any expenditure for personal services. Funds to make reimbursements authorized by the proposed legislation would be secured by the individual agencies through their regular appropriation requests to the Congress. When spread over the many Federal agencies which are authorized to transfer employees, these added costs would not be such that they would require additional funds to be budgeted. In other words, the differences in cost would be too minor in any one place to involve anything but the most nominal budget impact.

GOVERNMENT CENSORSHIP ON SOVIET TRADE

(Mr. LIPSCOMB asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a move which bears all the earmarks of Government censorship is the Department of Commerce announcement that beginning April 1, 1964, it will discontinue publication of the daily list of export licenses issued by the Department.

The daily list, entitled "Export Licenses Approved and Reexportations Authorized," provides day-to-day information on licenses issued by the Commerce Department outlining the type of commodities, their value, and the destination of exports authorized, including exports to Communist nations.

The practical effect of ceasing this publication would be to deny the public access to this data on a timely basis for there is no other similar source from which it is available.

As I mentioned to the House of Representatives on February 17, 1964, in commenting on this action by the Commerce Department, the only reason cited by the Department for wanting to discontinue the list is because of its workload and the cost of the daily list, which has been alleged to be \$25,000 a year.

I have been and continue to be all for economy in Government, but it is difficult to see how the Department can be seriously concerned about the cost of putting out this publication when it has pending before Congress a request for \$919 million to operate the Department for fiscal year 1965, including a request for \$8,203,000 for printing and reproduction work.

In addition, can the Department's claim that it needs to save tax money on publishing this list be valid in view of its role in the arranging of special subsidies to grain companies of \$2.8 million to help sell wheat to the U.S.S.R.? These subsidies represent expenditures in addition to the millions of dollars in the regular export subsidies involved in the wheat sales.

In 1961, shortly before publication of the daily export license list was begun, it was reported that Secretary of Commerce Hodges said with regard to the decision to publish information concerning granting of export licenses, "It would be consistent with the total national interest" to end the secrecy policy.

Later, in October of 1961, Secretary Hodges told the House Select Committee on Export Control, on which it was my privilege to serve:

I instituted some months ago the practice of issuing a daily report on export licenses approved by the Department. These reports give the fundamental data necessary to enable anyone to know what his Government is authorizing for export, to what country, and in what quantity or value.

What has changed? Is not it still consistent with the total national interest to publish this information? Is not it still important for the people to know what their Government is authorizing for export? I firmly believe it is.